DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 887 SO 014 444

AUTHOR Schneider, Donald O.
TITLE Henry Johnson: A Scholar-Educator in Historical Retrospect.
PUB DATE 25 Nov 82
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (November 25, 1982).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Biographies; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Psychology; Elementary Secondary Education; Foundations of Education; *History Instruction; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS Dewey (John); *Johnson (Henry); National Council for the Social Studies

ABSTRACT

As a teacher of history in the early 20th century, Henry Johnson believed in the importance of making history meaningful to students. He hoped that it would teach critical inquiry skills which could be used throughout life. He also emphasized the developmental aspect of history to explain how the present grew out of the past. Johnson studied the views of his contemporaries in education and agreed with many of John Dewey's approaches. He disagreed, however, with those who advocated a type of functional history centered around interests of students and society. He felt that knowledge of history, gained through inquiry and interpretation, was more important than the study of social problems. In 1921, Johnson helped form the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). Since he was one of the founders of NCSS, it is not unreasonable to speculate on what his reactions would be to the current position about the purpose of social studies as stated in the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines. Johnson would have agreed with the emphasis on using a broad range of resources; he would have disagreed with the attention given to social problems and the lack of attention given to the study of history. (BY)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED225887

Henry Johnson: A Scholar - Educator in Historical Retrospect

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald O. Schneider
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Donald O. Schneider

University of Georgia

A paper presented to the Foundations of the Social Studies SIG
Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies
November 25, 1982

SO 014 444

Henry Johnson: A Scholar - Educator in Historical Retrospect

Donald O. Schneider

University of Georgia

The Problem of Categorizing Johnson

Henry Johnson's most important contributions to the early twentieth century field of history teaching and social education have been described as "his emphasis on making historical instruction concrete; his analysis of the value of history; and his scorn for those who make proposals for the educational future while unaware of the rich experience and widsom of the past."[1] These significant contributions, especially his life-long professional effort to make history meaningful and useful for students without sacrificing its substantive quality may lead contemporary observors to view Johnson as a forerunner of the "New Social Studies" movements of the 1960s and early 1970s. His conviction, stated in 1915, that "history of almost any kind can be taught at almost any stage of instruction on the single condition that it is taught in a sensible way" ironically preceded Jerome Bruner's much more famous dictum by nearly a half century.[2] The irony is that it was Johnson who also scolded the "generalist" educational reformers of his era for their failure to do their homework in studying the history of education thereby assuming naively that they had discovered some new principle of education which in turn they all too often touted as the panacea for meeting some educational aim or another. Such study, which was provided in the "specialist" methods courses he and some of his academic colleagues offered at Teacher's College, showed according to Johnson, "that the 'new proposals of 'educators' were as old as the teaching of the subject."[3] Unfortunately, these courses "were heavily discounted by the educators whose formulas pointed to an 'only way' in education...."[4] Johnson was not being unduly harsh on his colleagues; he poked fun at himself for the same failing earlier in his life:

> In my own lifetime I seem to have seen the rise and fall of most of the educational ideas which I find in the literature of education from Plato and John Dewey. Of some of those ideas I have myself been original discoverer and have felt that because the ideas were new to me they must be new to the rest of the world, until I had the misfortune to stumble upon the same ideas in writings published before I was born. One of the things that history can do is to take the joy out of original discovery.[5]

In a more serious vein, he warned against a misinterpretation and misuse of history:

> To seek the easiest and shortest road to the use of the past in explaining the present is natural and proper. But any road that really reaches the desired end must make the past which it traverses intelligible and must, therefore, lead to what mattered then on the way to what matters now.[6]

Although some of Johnson's views seem comfortably contemporary, we must avoid unbalanced selectivity in examining his position. He also expressed positions that some contemporary social studies educators view as disquietingly "traditional." For example, he never really accepted the idea of a unified social studies as the desirable successor to separate social sciences with history as the central discipline. After all, "Most of the facts most of us know....are historical," Johnson contended.[7] He faulted the "new" social studies movement of the twenties and thirties for its failure to show students the connections among the wide array of topics incorporated in their classroom study, and for the repudiation by its advocates of "anything like general continuity [because it would be] an obstacle to the functional approach."[8] He was especially critical of social reconstructionists such as George S. Counts (but not by name) who advocated the building of a new social order using their own brand of subjective history without sufficient

awareness of those efforts and ideas of earlier "frontier thinkers."[9]

History, Johnson contended, had two unique contributions to make to the education of youth: "The historical method of arriving at facts," and "the historical idea of development."[10] Accepting the Ranke ideal of a new scientific professionalism in the historicans' craft, he stressed the need to teach students at all school levels the mind set and skills of historical inquiry and criticism. But he did not perceive students as being their own historians day in and day out. Teachers would continue to rely on traditional textbooks. They were to bring the traditional content alive through visualization, local applications, a rich array of supplementary literature and as much direct, personally meaningful student involvement as possible.

History should also help students to learn about the development and continuity of things past with the things present. It was the "special province of history to trace social development, showing by concrete examples of successive societies in action what society has been, how society has 'worked,' what causes and consequences of social action have been, and how society as it is grown out of society as it was."[11] Thus history was more than a collection of facts. Facts it had, but these were to be organized around the theme of development. Obviously selection was required. Reflecting a positivistic review of his field, Johnson contended that enough had been achieved by historians to identify "things of long endurance in the past which have now passed away and things of long endurance which still endure."[12] These things, ideas and developments together with the historical method, Johnson felt, "may properly be set up as the controlling aims of school instruction in history."[13]

Although Johnson advocated teaching students critical inquiry skills and a sense of historical development he did not shy away from the traditional

notions of mastering facts. Recitations both written and oral had their place and so too did emphasis on memorization.[14] Such methods, he argued, would give the students a necessary sense of mastery which would help make the subject interesting. These nuances in Johnson's views make it difficult to classify him as belonging to a particular school of history or educational thought as he himself cautioned those who endeavored to do so.[15] He expressed or accepted views that may be considered "conventional," "progressive," or in advance of his generation.[16] But his views are grounded in historical scholarship tempered by personal testing under actual classroom conditions; to his central views on the role of history in the classroom and the manner of teaching it to children--or advanced students--he held firmly throughout his later career.

Johnson's View of History

In 1867, when Henry Johnson was born in Sweden the day still belonged to the narrative historians whose concept of an American mission inspired and pervaded their works. The most widely read and most influential of these historians was George Bancroft who produced a ten volume history of the American people.[17] Bancroft's work epitomized the historgraphy of his age utilizing a wider array of sources than did others, while describing the natural continuity of events. He, as did others of his age, believed that God's devine hand guided historial development wherein progress toward a providential plan could be discerned in the unfolding of human events. One major legacy of Bancroft and other narrative historians was their emphasis on the necessity of precise historical methodology. A second was their sense of responsibility of public enlightenment rather than communication among a small group of peers.[18]

By the end of the 19th century history moved from being a hobby among gentlemen scholars, journalists and literary figures to an emerging profession practiced by rigorously trained university professionals. Led by Herbert Baxter Adams, Henry Adams and young scholars who went to Europe to study (especially in Germany), history became professionalized and systematized. Thus emerged a scientific history wherein scholars, conscious of the continuities in development of institutions and ideas within America and across the Atlantic, and competent in classical and old world languages, developed a new attitude toward the establishment and use of historical fact. These scientific historians taken as they were with the mehtods of critical analysis and verification of facts, shifted historical writing from broad sweeping narratives to heavily documented studies of well defined narrow problems, typically topical or institutional and regional in scope, although political history still prevailed.[19]

With the turn of the century came "The New History," a term coined by Edward Eggleston, but a movement whose major spokesmen became James Harvey Robinson and Charles A. Beard. Objectivity as an ideal gave way to the ideas of progress and reform. For proponents of the new history what really mattered most was asking questions about the past so as to shed light on concerns of the present. History was to assume a new utility, and, a set of new focal points. Attention was directed to modern history, to the social and economic realities of average people in their daily lives, to the rise of industry and labor and to tracing major intellectual currents. These "new historians" attempted to draw on the work of the emerging social sciences to provide new insights about the meaning of the historical changes they recorded. The progressive historian, like Progressives in other fields, had a civic responsibility to provide public

enlightenment on the major issues of the day in order to insure the continued progress of the nation.[21]

From among these changing currents of historgraphy, Johnson was to develop his views on the nature and purpose of history. His life as student and teacher of history spanned them all. His adoption of a particular view developed out of his school experiences as a boy in Sauk Centre, his University of Minnesota education, his early teaching experiences, the important years of teaching with Livingston C. Lord, graduate work at Columbia and a year of study in Europe. By the time he joined the faculty of Teachers College in 1906 he had become an advocate of the scientific historians' views. In 1915, at the age of 42 he wrote approvingly in his first edition of Teaching History that the "scientific conception of history [and] its fundamental idea....of development," dating back to ancient Greece and Rome, had finally become an "achievement....within the last seventy-five years."[22] He warned that "Uncritical histories of the narrative and didactic types are still being produced," and that there was still a demand, especially among schoolmasters, for history that provides "lessons in morals, or patriotism, or social service."[23] He recognized that the general reading public found the scientific history lacking in literary merit, but concluded that with scientific historians in control, history as "sober gray....fact" with its "balancing of probabilities" and lack of "definite conclusions," would continue to prevail.[24] Thus for Johnson, history had two chief elements: a process of historial, scientific inquiry that yielded an objective description and analysis of "the development of an individual, of a nation, of government, of religion, of education....of cookery, of dressmaking, or toys."[25] The ideal, though unattainable would be to "explain the whole development of civilization."[26] Such explanation begins with "what the past

was,....how it came to be, what it was....[and] how the present grew out of it."[26] Over a quarter of century later in the midst of World War II he clung to the same basic view of history, if anything more strongly than ever.[27]

He took issue with those--including the NEA Committee on the Social Studies and later Progressive educators of the social reconstructionist wing of the movement--who advocated a kind of functional history organized by what they deemed important in contemporary society. He argued that history so organized would be provincial, ephemeral, subject to becoming training grounds for extreme brands of nationalistic propaganda including "racial ideologies, prejudices, hatreds, and international misunderstanding," and consequently would fail to "correctly" represent or interpret the past.[28] However imperfect historical methodology is, that is no excuse for failure to employ its techniques. History, he argued, is not really a subject, but a method of arriving at the facts of our existence--one of three methods available to us. (He listed faith and direct observation as the others.)[29] Every person employs the method though most do it unconsciously and imperfectly "From the moment that the expression 'it was' begins to take on meaning, through life to the end of conscious existence...."[30] The challenge is clear to historians and educators alike: the conscious and improved use of historical methodology by us all must be a major goal of educators.

Johnson's View of Teaching History as a School Subject

When Johnson began his teaching career in 1885, history was not a major school subject.[31] By the time he accepted a position at Teachers College in 1906, history was well established in the secondary schools and moving into elementary schools. Nine years later when Johnson's first edition of Teaching History came off the press history was a respectable traditional subject

firmly and widely entrenched in the school curriculum. Its assent to prominence can be traced to the rapid rise of the public high school and the university as educational institutions, the professionalization of the field of history and the establishment of American Historical Association, and the influence of the AHA and NEA in bringing about curriculum reforms that accorded a prominent role to history.[32]

Just as historians of the period sought to find more adequate explanations to account for the incredible social, economic and political changes of the era, so too other intellectuals sought new constructs to explain the unfolding realities or to provide rationales for proposed reforms of perceived evils. Johnson absorbed and accepted some of these, adopted others, and rejected still others as he developed his own rationale and strategies for teaching history in the schools.

In the second half of the 19th century competing views of faculty psychology dominated educational practice. One view held that mental operations such as memory, imagination and reasoning where linked in the mind. Training and development of one faculty was therefore beneficial to others. In educational practice this view led to the use of identical materials and methods of instruction. Those who thought faculties were separate entities that developed serially and chronologically, saw the necessity of separate sequential training of the separate faculties. Proponents of both views, however, generally accepted "formal discipline" or transfer of training theory which assumed that training of one faculty in one context would be beneficial when the individual needed to use that faculty in a completely different context. The faculty psychology/formal discipline view reached its nadir in educational circles with its sanctioning in the 1894 Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies.[33]

Challenging these prevailing conceptions were those who conceived the mind as a tabula rosa and called attention to the importance of environment and experience in developing student intellect, interests and habits. The earliest challenger to faculty psychology was the Herbartian movement. The Herbartians denied the existence of separate, innate faculties of the mind. As they viewed it, children learned through appropriate experience involving sense perception that begins by linking the learning task with student interest and eventually provided for application through a five step methodology. Since individuals had no inherited instincts it was also a necessary task of education to build a pupil's character as well as his intellect. The Herbartian movement had a powerful influence on American education which itself stimulated competing approaches to schooling. On the one hand was the emphasis on lock-step methodology; on the other was a search for ways to individualize instruction according to students' individual rates of learning. Both lines of influence lasted well into the 20th century.[34]

As the Herbartians vied with the faculty psychologists, a "new psychology" was conceived that had its roots in evolutionary theory as applied to human behavior by Herbert Spencer and others in Europe and by the William James in the United States. Social Darwinism stressed change and adaptation of human beings and social institutions. To this James added the significant conception that adjustment was a two way process in which not only is the individual changed but in the interaction also changes the environment. James discarded faculty psychology and its attendent pedagogical methods. From his studies he concluded that habits had to be developed and refined through appropriate and specific adaptive experiences, not through some generalized faculty training in accordance to laws of association.[35]

James's work inspired two different lines of psychological and

educational thought. One moved toward behaviorism through Edward L. Thorndike and John B. Watson and the other toward Progressivism through John Dewey and in the extreme to the child centered conceptions usually associated with William Heard Kilpatrick. Thorndike developed the concept of S-R bonds and the importance of the connection or "bonds" in the interaction process. Education was to perpetuate some kinds of connections, eliminate some and modify others so as to increase the individual's educational potential. He proposed a set of principles to guide educators, emphasizing readiness, exercise and effect. Learning and the development of "character" became a matter of forming appropriate habits in which the role of the teacher was central. From Thorndike's work sprang a series of movements: mental measurement and testing, the use of specific objectives, and unit planning. From the movement came those educational applications developed in the first third of the 20th century such as Carelton Washburne's Winnetka plan and in Henry Clinton Morrison's model of unit planning. Taken to an extreme and combined with social evolutionary thought it led to David Snedden's position that every school activity had to be related to a useful social function. In these conceptions, educational thought and practice became congruent with the prevailing social efficiency movement of the period.[36]

Although John Dewey's thought was to have a monumental impact on educational theory and practice, Henry Johnson was not particularly impressed by Dewey when he sat in his course at the University of Wisconsin in 1888.[37] Later, when both were at Columbia, Johnson was to find much in Dewey's view with which he could agree. One of Dewey's characteristic ways of approaching a subject was, in Hegelian fashion, to distinguish the chief ingredients of opposing positions and then to seek an acceptable middle ground or synthesis of the essential points. So it was with his attempts at reconciling

"child centered" and "subject centered" positions. Drawing on James, Dewey saw learning resulting from the interaction of the child and his environment. What resulted, if properly guided, was the growth of the child through a process of continuous reconstruction of experience using reflective or purposeful structured thinking. The end goal was to enable children to develop their instincts into habits that had sufficient force to guide their conduct so that as individual they could live in harmony with their society. Dewey saw utility and necessity in transmitting knowledge generated over the ages. The key was for the teacher to be selective, to be aware of the child's limitations and to find ways to provide experiences whereby the child could meaningfully add or "reconstruct" the outside knowledge to his own inner structures. When others such as Kilpatrick appeared to discount the value of traditional bodies of subject knowledge "imposed" on students by teachers with little regard for their interests and needs, Dewey could remind them of the value of such knowledge.[38]

Henry Johnson's life spanned these currents and counter currents of educational thought. Some he experienced as a student, others he drew upon or reflected in his own teaching and still others he rejected. One perennial issue that these cross current posed for educator's of the period was the degree of emphasis to be given to scholarship, demands of society of and interests and capacities of pupils. For Johns , the balance tilted primarily toward scholarship and secondarily toward the learner; society's needs would best be met by transmitting the body of knowledge generated by historians and by imbuing students with an attitude of critical inquiry and developing in them the skills to engage in such inquiry when occasion in their lives required it. Johnson was well aware of the balance educators attempted to achieve among the competing interests of scholarship, society and student. He praised the AHA

Commission on the Social Studies (of which he was a member) for its valiant efforts at striking an appropriate balance in its Conculsions and Recommendations, although the report shifted the scale more toward societal concerns than he himself advocated in his writing.[39] That he signed the report is an indication of some flexibility in his position, but in his own writing he continued to emphasize the need to present traditional historical scholarship in meaningful ways to students and warned of the dangers of distorting history to fit pedagogical concepts or shifting national and social trends and pressures.

Depending on one's perspective Johnson's views can be seen as traditional and old fashioned or scholarly, perceptive and progressive. Johnson acknowledges his chamelian quality in relating several humorous incidents where observors classified his teaching as being representative of the old fashioned method, socialized recitation, the Herbartian method, the problem method or the project method.[40]

While Johnson decried the reliance on purely didactic methods of instruction which relied on recitation and drill, he did not find memorization and recitation to be without merit. Recalling the immediate and long range personal benefits he derived from his own experiences with traditional methods, he could still argue in 1940 that "There is a place for rapid-fire memory questions. They are useful for purposes of drill and review. They are fair and proper tests of the reaction time of the pupil."[41] He quickly added, however, that most emphasis should be placed on thought-provoking questions. Similarly, he defended recitation lessons, especially those that required writing because "Most American schools have too little rather than too much written work." When it came to testing students he argued that although the bulk of the questions should call for student interpretation, 1/4 to 1/3 could be memory type questions requiring the recall of specific

information.[42] If memory questions were to be asked how was the pupil to prepare? In Johnson's view cramming was quite acceptable.[43]

Johnson's advocacy of such methods is pulled out of context here to make a point. He was fully aware of all the shortcomings of over-emphasis on recitation and memorization. Much of both editions of his textbook was given over to providing alternatives to the abuses and to improving the use of traditional methods when employed in the social studies classroom. But for Johnson a body of knowledge needed to be imparted and learned; reflection and interpretation required the acquisition of specific information. Not only that, but the possession of historical facts would serve the individual well in later life by helping tie past with present, reducing provincialism and teaching humility about the "discovery" of new ideas. For these reasons it was not harmful if some factual repetition occurred from grade to grade:

> A certain amount of repetition may in any event be defended. If there are facts in history which it is desirable to fix firmly, repetition is desirable, and if facts are fixed so firmly as to give pupils a sense of mastery, there may be joy in repetition. The cure for the boredom of repetition may, therefore, at times be more repetition.[44]

The repetition, of course, was to be undertaken in new and challenging ways that would build upon and extend the meaning of the repeated facts.

Johnson's approach in this and other matters was, like Dewey's, a search for a defensible middle ground. He found fault with the academic specialists who gave too little attention to teaching methods and generalists who eschewed scholarly substance. His view that the process of making ideas and principles meaningful was similar for students at all levels from early primary grades to graduate school resulted in disputes with both the academic scholars and education professors.[45] Looking back over his life's work in

1943, he observed that:

> "The experience of young children is of course limited but much more can be brought within the experience than by any psychology with which I am acquainted or by any primary teacher whose work I have observed."[46]

His views about the appropriateness of historical content for very young pupils may have been rare, but his basic principles of implementation certainly were not. His general principle was a classically Progressive Deweyan view: "of getting lessons into the direct experience of pupils."[47] That he was a pragmatist, he left little doubt; he used whatever methods seemed to work, be they recitation, the problem method or the project method.

One of his concerns about various "new" pedagogical methods and approaches was the tendency of their proponents to so formalize them that they became ends in themselves rather than serving as means to learning. He complained, for example, about the formalism of the Herbartians and the rigid implementation of the project method (whose 20th century orginator, William Heard Kilpatrick, he charged failed to illustrate the method in his own classroom).[48] He also took issue with those child-centered educators who suggested sequencing history according to purported interests and needs of children without regard to the nature of history.[49] Thus while he saw the use of community study, biography and other resources as useful and desirable, these had to be organized to lead children to an understanding of the larger warp and woof of history. The learning experience was to fit the child to the discipline of history; history was not to be fitted to the shifting interests of students, or for that matter of soceity.

After rejecting many past and current ways of organizing history for children, he provided his own view of introducing children to the substance of history:

> What history is possible for children? All that history deals with can be reduced to four general kinds of phenomena: (1) physical human beings and their physical environment; (2) what human beings did; (3) what human beings said or wrote; (4) what human beings thought and felt--the motives that led them to do or to say. In the varying conditions under which these general kinds of phenomena come before us, there may be some hint of what is possible for children.[50]

Such was the broad outline of history he would introduce through methods that would transmit information yet provide for critical analysis, and interpretation.

Note, that I said transmit information. We tend to remember Johnson for his advocacy of experiencially based and inquiry oriented instruction. Such experiences there would be, but they would supplement the presentation of information by teachers and textbooks:

> [The] view....here adopted, is that the greater part of school history must be presented as ready made information, but that there should be illustrations of the historical method sufficient to indicate the general nature of the problems behind organized history and sufficient to give some training in the solutions of such problems.[51]

Johnson claimed that he arrived at his basic views on teaching of history while still in his twenties and teaching of the State Normal School at Moorehead, Wisconsin, under the presidency of Livingston C. Lord. It was Lord, whom Johnson felt was the greatest teacher he had ever know, who apparently reinforced Johnson's teaching efforts and lead him to the conscious articulation of the principle of "getting what is taught into the direct experience of pupils."[52] As so often is the case, the major ideas of the generation were "in the air" and ripe for discovery. Johnson's most essential principle of teaching was Deweyan; but his views also contained ideas congruent with the faculty psychology principle of transfer of learning, some of the Herbartian's methodology of teaching, with James's view of the need for the development of habits and Dewey's view of the importance of both sujbect matter and

the learner's inneraction with it.

Henry Johnson: A Generation Later

For Johnson, history was the story of development, of how things changed and got to be what they are. It was also a process of critical inquiry. One danger that historians faced was inquiring about the past in terms of questions of the present. He cautioned that the past had to be understood on its own terms in light of questions that people asked about their own generation. Thus far I have honored Johnson's view, but aware of the risk of falling victim to presentism, let me make a few comments about Johnson on the basis of some of our present views of teaching social studies. Since Johnson was one of the founders of the National Council for the Social Studies it is not unreasonable to ask what he would have thought of NCSS's current position about the purpose of the social studies, the place of history in the social studies, methods of instructions and other related matters. Currently, the most definitive statement of NCSS's position is found in its 1979 revision of Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines.[53]

The guidelines declare that basic goal of social studies to be the preparation of young people "to be humane, rational, participating citizens" in an increasingly interdependent world. The authors call for a commitment to foster human dignity and rational process through a curriculum that emphasizes coequally important components of knowledge, abilities, valuing and social participation. Although the social sciences, including history should be an important source of knowledge for the social studies, they are no longer prominent. The needs of students and society are to be the determinants for justifying choices of knowledge sources which could include other disciplines, the mass media, and "offbeat" sources reflected in the arts. The knowledge component is to provide an historical perspective and a global perspective which together would serve as a foundation for social participation.

Abilities to be developed include intellectual or thinking competencies, data processing skills and human relations competencies. Valuing is to be considered in part an intellectual ability but is far broader. The role of the school in the area of valuing is complex--partly inculcator of such core values as justice, fair play and free speech, and partly provider of opportunities for free examination of value dilemmas. Finally, the social studies is to give special attention to the resolution of social problems through rational, active and systematic student social participation ranging from observation and information seeking to community service and political participation, including responsible public demonstration.

Although there are a number of elements in the guidelines with which Johnson could have agreed, much of the statement would have been disturbing to him. Not only is the role of the social sciences downgraded in the guidelines, but history is mentioned in only a single sentence and one footnote in the rationale section. Although Johnson would have agreed with the Guidelines that history serves as a "buffer against detachment and presentism," he would have been shocked at the extent of its general demise in this NCSS statement. The shifting of the balance between the status of the disciplines compared to social problems and children's needs would have been unacceptable to Johnson--a shift he would have considered to be dangerous because it would lead to curriculum chaos, fadishness, and narrowness of vision. Indeed, he warned of just such failures two decades after the founding of NCSS.[54] The one specific assessment of history offered in the Guidelines would have drawn a mixed reaction from Johnson:

> "School history" is often repetitive, bland, merely narrative, and inattentive to the non-Western world and to developing nations; is distorted by ignoring the experiences of Blacks, Hispanics, native American Indians, Puerto Ricans, Orientals Americans, and women.[55]

History was poorly taught in his era as well; he too called for a broader "world history, though his own orientation extended primarily to Europe. History need not be bland; repetition could be beneficial if handled differently. The treatment of minorities was not something Johnson ever addressed specifically.

The Guidelines' emphasis on a broad range of learning resources is certainly compatible with Johnson's views. He preceeded their suggestions by nearly two generations in his discussion of maps, visuals, newspaper, and the local community. Similarly, his concerns with the development of "critical" abilities and skills in using and interpreting various data sources is consistent with the thurst of the Guidelines. The difference is that Johnson would have developed students skills in the context of a history curriculum, not an amorphous social studies program that to him would lack coherence and organization.

This overview, although brief, does suggest how far we have moved--or drifted as some might argue--from the classical position advocated so ably by Henry Johnson in the first half of this century. Some of our aims as represented in the NCSS Guidelines appear to be similar to those he advocated, but he clearly would feel remorse at the ahistorical bent taken by organization he helped to found in 1921. As Hazel Hertzberg has reminded us, "The social studies reform movements of the past two decades have been more cut off from their own past than have any other such major movements in the past century."[56] If we followed Johnson's example we would study our own past in order to understand how we got here and to gain some humility about the uniqueness of our educational ideas and practices as related to social education. Following his example we would also restore history as the organizing core around which we would rebuild our social studies curriculum.

Footnotes

[1]Paul Robinson, "The Earliest Master: Henry Johnson," paper presented at the National Council for Social Studies Annual Meeting, November, 1981, p. 19.

[2]Henry Johnson, Teaching of History in Elementary and Secondary Schools, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1915), p. XXI.

[3]Henry Johnson, The Other Side of Main Street: A History Teacher from Sauk Centre, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943), pp. 205-206.

[4]Ibid., p. 206.

[5]Ibid., pp. 238-239.

[6]Henry Johnson, An Introduction to the History of the Social Sciences Part II, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, American Historical Association, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons), p. 136.

[7]Johnson, Main Street, p. 248.

[8]Ibid., p. 253.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid., p. 255.

[11]Henry Johnson, Teaching of History in Elementary and Secondary Schools with Applications to Allied Studies, (New York: The Macmillan Company), 1940, p. 122.

[12]Johnson, Main Street, p. 255.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Johnson, Teaching of History, 1940, p. 89, 278.

[15]Johnson, Main Street, p. 215.

[16] Paul Robinson, "The Conventional Historians of the Social Studies, "Theory and Research in Social Education (Fall, 1980) 8, 65-87; Donald Schneider, "The Historical Method in the Teaching of History," Peabody Journal of Education (January, 1963) 40, 199-209; Johnson was one of those who signed the controversial Conclusions and Recommendations...(1933) of the AHA's Commission on the Social Studies.

[17] George Bancroft, History of the United States, 10 vols., (Boston: Little, Brown 1842-74).

[18] Oscar Handlin, Truth in History (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1979), pp. 55-58.

[19] Ibid., pp. 60-67; Hazel Whitman Hertzberg, Social Studies Reform 1880-1980 (Boulder Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, 1981), p. 6.

[20] Hertzberg, pp. 18-19.

[21] Johnson, Teaching of History, 1915, pp. 26-27.

[22] Ibid., p. 27.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid., p. 18.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Johnson, Main Street, p. 254-256.

[28] Ibid., pp. 246-247; Johnson, History of the Social Sciences, p. 122.

[29] Ibid., p. 248.

[30] Ibid., p. 249.

[31] Hertzberg, Social Studies Reform, p. 4.

[32] Ibid., pp. 4-16.

[33] National Education Association, Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies with the Reports of the Conferences Arranged by the Committee, (New York: American Book Company, 1894).

[34] V. T. Thayer, Formative Ideas in American Education from the Colonial Period to the Present, (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1965) pp. 203-210; Ernest E. Bayles and Bruce Hood, Growth of American Educational Thought and Practice, (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 139-160

[35] Thayer, Formative Ideas, pp. 156-159; Erwin V. Johanningmeir, Americans and Their Schools, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1980), pp. 202-203.

[36] Bayles and Hood, Educational Thought, chapter 10; Thayer, Formative Ideas, chapter 10, Johanningmeier, Americans and Their Schools, pp. 238-239; Walter Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967). For a revisionist view see Clarence J. Karier, "Liberal Ideology and the Quest for Orderly Social Change," in Karier and others. Roots of Crises: American Education in the Twentieth Century, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

[37] Johnson, Main Street, pp. 58-59.

[38] Thayer, Formative Ideas, chapter 11; Bayles and Hood, Educational Thought, chapters 11-12; for an alternative view see, Gilbert G. Gonzales, Progressive Education: A Marxist Interpretation (Minneapolis: Marxist Educational Press, 1982), chapter 4.

[39] Johnson, Teaching of History, 1940, pp. 76-79.

[40] Johnson, Main Street, pp. 229-230

[41] Johnson, Teaching of History, 1940, p. 278. See Main Street, p. 75, for an example of personal benefit he derived: "In high school we had ten weeks with Townsend's little book on civil government. That gave us time to memorize the constitution of the United States. I have never regretted the time so spent."

[42] Johnson, Teaching of History, 1915, p. 435.

[43] Johnson, Teaching of History, 1940, p. 379.

[44] Ibid., p. 89.

[45] Johnson, Main Street, pp. 205-225.

[46] Ibid., p. 215

[47] Ibid., p. 229.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Johnson, Teaching of History, 1940, p. 90.

[50] Ibid., p. 97.

[51] Johnson, Teaching of History, 1915, pp. 360-61

[52] Johnson, Main Street, p. 106.

[53] Richard Osborne and others in Social Education, (April 1979) 43, pp. 261-278.

[54] Johnson, Main Street, pp. 229, 253.

[55] Osborne, "Curriculum Guidelines," pp. 268-69.

[56] Hertzberg., Social Studies Reform, p. 169.